



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## SHAKESPEARE'S TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.

BY D. J. SNIDER.

The frame-work of this drama is the the Trojan war. It has nearly the same limits as the Iliad; for it presupposes the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon and the withdrawal of Achilles till the death of his friend Patroclus, when he again goes into battle and slays Hector. Many Homeric incidents and motives are retained, while many are introduced which would have made the old Greek bard stare with wonder. The famous heroes of the Iliad are brought before us, but we can hardly recognize them in their modern shape; the beautiful plastic outline is not lost but is subordinated to the inner element of character. The statue is transformed to flesh and blood. Shakespeare has taken these antique ideal forms and poured into them the subjective intensity of the modern world. This is the greatest and most enduring ground of interest in the present drama. The old Greek hero is now moved not by the god from without, but by himself from within, the divine influence is transmuted into his own intelligence. Ulysses, the favorite of Minerva, no longer meets the goddess upon the highways and addresses her in familiar accents, but communes with his own spirit. In other words, the ancient Epic has changed into the modern Drama. The meaning is the same both in Homer and in Shakespeare, but how different is the form! Yet it must not be forgotten that the outside is Greek though the inside is Anglo-Saxon; the Hellenic mould is always visible, though it is not the sole nor even the most prominent object of interest.

The contrast is certainly striking, and is often so incongruous as to convey the notion of a humorous purpose. In the mouths of these old Homeric personages the Poet has placed the most abstract statement of what may be called his philosophy, that is to be found in any of his works. His views of society, of life, of institutions, are here expressed in a language as direct and definite as that employed by the thinker trained to the use of the abstruse terms of the schools. What these principles are, and their influence upon his literary activity, will be discussed further on. The reflections are mainly political, but are sometimes

psychological, and show a mind most subtly scrutinizing its own processes. Those who hold that Shakespeare was the supremely unconscious poet, would do well to study this play till they understand it, if indeed it can be fully understood without some philosophical culture and knowledge.

But the strangest and most incongruous element which is foisted into this old Homeric company is the manners of chivalry. It amounts to downright burlesque, and such beyond any doubt it was intended to be by the author. The best passage for illustrating this phase of the drama is the challenge borne by Æneas from Hector. All the heroes seem to be transformed into medieval knights, each one of whom is ready to prove the supreme beauty of his mistress by ordeal of battle. The climax of humor is attained when the aged Nestor, who has lived three generations of men, comes forward and offers to demonstrate to Hector by proof of arms, "That my lady was fairer than his grandam." The principles of honor, valor, love, hospitality, with which these personages are endowed, give to the whole action the pleasing aroma of the Middle Ages. The reflective element before mentioned, which was injected into the characters of the old heroes, is serious rather than humorous, but the chivalrous element is purely humorous, and turns them all into Don Quixotes. With Shakespeare the age of chivalry is past, and it is with him an object of ridicule as much as with Cervantes. The hoary shapes of antiquity he thus places in a modern institution, which however was already worn out in his own time and laughed at by the whole world.

Such is the Homeric group which is introduced into the present drama, but there is also another set of persons here whose principle and whose actions are unknown to the Iliad. Love is now the main business, not war. The legend of Troilus, Cressida and Pandarus is the creation of the later romancers, which was grafted on the old story of Troy. It portrays the struggle of the tender passion in one of its phases, the fidelity of man and the falsity of woman. The burning intensity, the fierce conflicts, the supreme power of love, find their expression in this part of the fable, which is indeed a later development of human spirit. Still the relation between the two groups must be traced; the Trojan war was caused by the faithlessness of a woman whose restoration is demanded by the Nation; the refusal calls out the heroes who are seeking to bring her back by force. Female infi-

delity is the theme; in the one case it involves the Family merely, but in the other case it involves the State. Helen and Cressida therefore resemble each other; both perform the same deed, though in different relations which also produce different results.

Such are the two threads running through the play; they may be named according to their leading tendency the love-thread and the war-thread; though parallel in action, in thought the first is the source of the second. The movements also are two, the division being manifest not only by a difference in principle, but also by a difference in merit. The first movement in general passes from strife and separation to unity. The parted lovers are brought together by the mediation of Pandarus, and are made happy by mutual vows of devotion. In Troy the division of opinion which previously existed is healed; in the Greek host the angry Achilles is wrought upon by the cunning of Ulysses. and seems to resolve to take part again in the war; thus the hostile armies come to internal harmony preparatory to the external struggle. The second movement portrays the passage from union to disruption and conflict. The lovers on the one hand are torn asunder by an unforeseen occurrence; Cressida proves faithless, and thus the bond of emotion is broken. The combat on the other hand arises between the two hostile forces, after many fluctuations, Hector, the Trojan hero, is slain, his countrymen cease from their attack and retire to the city; things are left as they were before. The negative termination of the play is striking; Troilus and Cressida are separated, and the foes still confront each other with warlike preparation.

Taking up the love-thread and following it through the first movement, we observe that the divine passion has been already excited in the bosoms of the lovers, and moves on speedily to its fruition in the betrothal. Troilus is first introduced to us: he is still young and impulsive, he is completely swayed by his strong and intense emotions. He has met the fair Cressida, though the circumstances are not told; at once we see him literally consumed with the sacred flame. She dances before his mind continually, sighs burst forth unbidden from his heart, every duty or purpose is swallowed up in the whirlpool of his passion. Such is the lover pure and simple, the Romeo of the world. But Troilus has another trait which gives him dignity and elevation of character, and which stands in the most direct opposition to

his absorption in his feelings. He is a man of action, a warrior second only (if not equal) to Hector, and a patriotic defender of his country. But these two elements of his nature are now in deadly struggle, in his own breast is the conflict between Love and War. Honor and ambition call him to the field, where the destiny of Fatherland is being decided. But passion has seized him in its firmest grasp, its supremacy is declared in the very first line of the play, where, after arming himself for battle, he calls out

“I'll unarm again;  
Why should I war without the walls of Troy,  
That find such cruel battle here within?”

Such is the first triumph of Love over the bold warrior, it has tamed him till he is “weaker than a woman's tear,”—which, notwithstanding the contemptuous expression of Troilus, is an instrument of considerable power. But now there is another combat which he has to wage, fierce, incessant, lachrymose. The favor of the fair Cressida seems very uncertain, her uncle cannot wind up the negotiation with sufficient speed. Troilus therefore feels in his heart that most painful of all pangs, the pang of unrequited love. Still he has hope, though he is very impatient, and Pandarus keeps alive his imagination by recounting the charms of his beautiful mistress. At last the mediator brings about their meeting; Troilus is all fervor and passion, he makes the first declaration of devotion, which is followed by that of Cressida. Open, sincere, even unsophisticated is the youthful suitor, the best model of the love-hero that Shakespeare has left us. His emotion is so pure, intense and direct that its beauty has no flaw, while at the same time his character rises out of a mere emotional existence into the region of the noblest manly activity. It is true that love asserts its mastery for the time being, still it does not quench his zeal for his country. But now, as the conflict within him is soothed to repose by his union, Troilus will be himself again if jealous Fate will but refrain from interference. Such good behavior, however, can hardly be expected of it in a drama. Let the reader, with gloomy foreboding, await the outcome of the story a few pages ahead.

Pandarus has been just mentioned as the mediating power between the two lovers. His function is not very important, since both the man and the woman are touched with a mutual passion,

which is sufficient to bring them together without any assistance. Pandarus is rather a busy-body, active yet harmless. He is certainly not a villain, the alliance which he seeks to bring about is worthy, his means can hardly be condemned by the rigid moralist, though his jokes are a little too free for the modern ear. Assuredly the odious word "pander," which is supposed to be derived from his name, cannot justly be applied to his conduct in this drama. Moreover his understanding is not strong; the artful Cressida stands far above all his schemes and makes fun of him, though he is able to exercise a good deal of control over the ardent and simple-hearted Troilus. His name has brought upon him a legacy of abuse which his deed in no sense justifies. There is not an enterprising mother in the land who does not do as much without a breath of condemnation.

Cressida receives after Troilus a visit from the industrious match-maker, who tries to excite her love and admiration for the youthful hero in every manner possible. The name of Troilus is continually introduced in the conversation; his beauty, intellect, youth, are the themes of great praise, but it is his valor which is the main subject of laudation. The famous heroes of Troy are made to pass in review one after another, the noble Troilus is superior to them all, even Hector is no exception. But the adroit Cressida listens to the encomiums bestowed by her uncle, with a complete penetration of their object, parrying his questions, tormenting him with a feigned opposition, uttering words of detraction against Troilus, indulging in the most wanton jests; in fine she teases her dear uncle to desperation, and conceals from him completely her real feelings and purposes. He confesses that he cannot understand her, while she probes him to the bottom by her blunt words: "You are a bawd." Her character comes out plain in this interview, she is shrewd, witty, and wanton, no person of the calibre of Pandarus can touch the depths of her mind; the cool understanding effectually controls the emotions.

Such a woman is now to be seen in love; for she all the time has cherished a secret affection for Troilus. What will she turn out to be? Her admiration is genuine, in her monologue in which she has no motive for concealment, she says that she sees in the actual Troilus a thousand fold more "than in the glass of Pandar's praise may be." But feeling must be suppressed, she therefore does just what might be expected, she refuses subordi-

nation to love. Her argument is without the trace of passion, and is directed against passion :

“ Things won are done, joy’s soul lies in the doing—  
 Men prize the thing ungained more than it is (worth)—  
 Achieved, (we), men still command; ungained, beseech ;  
 Then, though my heart’s content firm love doth bear,  
 Nothing of that shall from mine eyes appear.”

That is, consummation dampens ardor, suspense keeps it alive. Led by this specious reasoning, she intends to keep under the rising flame; and make the true love of her devoted suitor her sport and his instrument of torture. The emotion which she feels must be concealed, and converted to a means for some other end besides mutual union. She is the intellectual coquette.

The fundamental distinction between the characters of Troilus and Cressida is now apparent. The man resigns himself to his love, many great interests are pressing him but they are brushed aside, his sacrifice is complete. But the woman subordinates her love to her understanding, to her planning and scheming, she refuses the absolute surrender to the feeling of Family. She therefore must be declared to be untrue to the deepest principle of her sex. Her falsity hereafter is adequately motivated by this single trait ; love, devotion to the one individual, is not the controlling impulse of her nature. But we must advance to the next stage : the good offices of Pandarus bring about their meeting ; it has already been noticed how Troilus, true to character, makes an immediate and unreserved declaration of the most fervent devotion. But Cressida is also true to her character ; she hesitates, suspects, makes abstract reflections of various kinds ; when she does whisper her love, she repents, reproaches herself with having “ blabbed,” and is forever recalling what she has said. “ Where is my wit ? ” she asks ; for wit is her boast, to it she is always trying to subject her words and actions. There is no full, free resignation, but she is continually catching herself and her utterances, as if her thought had to go back and take a glance at itself. Her mind is her pride, she is really ashamed of her love. Cressida is best designated by calling her the opposite of that which Troilus describes himself to be :

“ I am as true as truth’s simplicity,  
 And simpler than the infancy of truth.”

For she is full of falsity and stratagem. Both take a vow of eternal fidelity, yet with a wonderful difference of manner, which is prophetic of the future.

To this love-thread must be added the appearance of Helen and Paris. They hardly belong to the action, and the pretext upon which they are introduced is very slender. But thereby we are forced to cast a glance into the remote background of the war and observe their relation to Troilus and Cressida. Their life is a sensual resignation to love, for its sake all ethical ties are disregarded, even nationality is jeopardized. But it is the god to whom absolute submission must be yielded; the song of Pandorus declares its almighty power as well as its pang. Paris is kept out of the fray by the spell of Helen while all his guiltless brothers are fighting in the front rank of battle. So, too, Troilus disarms himself when his heart is subdued, the spirit of love is stronger than the spirit of war. Helen has already manifested the infidelity which Cressida will hereafter manifest: the husband, Menelaus, who seeks to recover his wife by force of arms, is not less devoted than Troilus the lover. It is the story of women faithless and of men faithful; the ordinary romance is reversed. Thus the famous couple are dismissed, they will not further be employed by the Poet, who must not repeat his theme, and hence must pass to the consequences of that memorable elopement, namely the siege of Troy. But we catch a glimpse of their world, its sweet dalliance and sensual indulgence; there is enthroned the queen of beauty whose might none can resist: even Hector, it is declared, Hector the true husband and stern warrior would yield to the blandishments of this mortal Venus:

“Sweet Helen, I must woo you  
To help unarm our Hector: his stubborn buckles,  
With these your white enchanting fingers touched,  
Shall more obey than to the edge of steel,  
Or force of Greekish sinews: you shall do more  
Than all the island Kings—disarm great Hector.”

We now pass to the war-thread, the structure of which is somewhat complex and therefore must be carefully analyzed. In the first place there are two sides, the Trojan and the Grecian, which are arrayed against each other in war. But in the second place each side has two parties or factions which are opposed to



each other mainly though not wholly on questions of policy. These internal differences are now to be portrayed, the characters which maintain the conflicting opinions are to be grouped and designated, the means are to be shown whereby each side arrives at a substantial harmony within itself. Such is the first movement, from separation to union.

The siege has lasted seven years, and still the walls of Troy are standing. The Grecian princes have lost hope, and seem ready to abandon the enterprise. Failure has to be acknowledged, there can be no longer any disguise. It is a situation of despair, a great national undertaking must be given up, whose abandonment comes next to the loss of civil freedom. This is the trying political situation; what is its cause, and what is its cure? The heroes have to address themselves to the dangerous condition of affairs, their various characters will be manifested according to their conduct in the present emergency, it is a time which tries men's souls.

The first speaker is Agamemnon, commander-in-chief. He utters the word of hope. It is true that their plans have hitherto failed, but such is the course of all great enterprises, something always arises to obstruct them, the realization never equals the thought. "Persistivest constancy" is the supreme test of manhood, let us not give way to adverse fortune. The language of Agamemnon is full of dignity and encouragement, in him centre the aspirations of the Greek army, he represents its desire, its purpose, its endurance, but not its intelligence. He does not speak of the cause of the ill success of the war, nor of the remedy for the present evils; he can only attribute them to the caprice of fortune—a solution which always indicates blindness. Empty hope, perseverance without reason, good intention without power he possesses in a high degree; as leader, he is hardly more than a respectable figure-head. But it must not be thought that he is out of place, he brings to his office rank, character, experience, and personal dignity, which perhaps could not be found so happily blended in any other chieftain; the brain however must be supplied from a different source. Thus Agamemnon, notwithstanding his high position, seems a puppet to a certain extent, for he does not furnish the ultimate moving principle.

Next comes Nestor, "the old man eloquent," who echoes the sentiments of the commander, and enforces them by new arguments and illustrations. In him the orator appears, he adorns

his speech with the graces of diction, employing a great profusion of figures and speaking in a vein of strong enthusiasm. The distinction in their styles of address is plainly indicated by Ulysses: the words of Nestor are beautifully ornamented, "hatched in silver," while those of Agamemnon are more strong and homely, and should be held "up high in brass." But the character of the old hero is the interesting point. Nestor is not the man who creates, but is the man who appreciates and gives utterance to the thought of others. The new plan is laid before him, his opinion is decisive. Too old for invention, his powers of judgment have increased with age, none of the passions of youth or the jealousies of leadership obscure his vision, his mind grasps the thing as it is without the least taint of prejudice. But the thought must first be brought before him, he cannot originate it, the choice of what is best is his strength. Appreciation and expression are the salient points of the white-haired sage of the Greeks.

Now to complete the triad of characters we must have the originator, the man of creative intelligence. Here he appears and is on the point of speaking. Ulysses, for such is his name, is the supreme personage of the drama, the proportions of his intellect are truly colossal. He understands the difficulty at once, and sees the remedy; above all human beings he possesses insight and invention, he clearly comprehends the causes of the existing evils and knows their cure. He will not be content to utter innocent platitudes, that fortune is fickle, that men must be patient, that reverses show the true worth of the warrior. Failure has overtaken the expedition, there is some good reason for it, and he intends to go to the bottom of the matter. The disease however deep-seated must be discovered, and then the medicine can be applied. Such a discussion will lead Ulysses to examine the whole organization of the Greeks before Troy, and his argument will draw in the general principles of all social institutions and even of individual conduct.

Such is the representative group of the one party in the Grecian army; it is the positive, patriotic party, which believes in prosecuting the war to a glorious termination. This element is common to the three, but the fine gradation in their characterization should be distinctly noticed. Agamemnon is the embodiment of all the lofty impulses of the grand national enterprise, and hence is truly the leader of the people: but his limitations

are his feelings ; faith, hope, perseverance, good intention, cannot take the place of knowledge. Nestor rises higher, he has appreciative intelligence united with the golden gift of persuasion ; he first repeats the somewhat empty exhortations of Agamemnon, but when the deeper nature of Ulysses opens its treasures for his judgment, he yields an unhesitating assent. The apex is of course occupied by Ulysses, whose crowning gift is, as before said, creative intelligence.

Let us now listen to what such a man has to say about the nature of the existing evils and their remedy, for certainly his words will be worthy of attention. "The specialty of rule hath been neglected ;" the individual has not performed the particular function allotted to him ; there has been no subordination and hence no organization in the Grecian army. To illustrate his principle Ulysses goes through the physical and intellectual universe, the same law of harmony prevails everywhere. The planetary system with its central power, "Sol, in noble eminence enthroned and sphered" is a striking example which is here elaborated in great detail. But it is the social fabric, the institutions of man in which the necessity of degree, of subordination is most plainly manifested. Without it the whole realized world of right would crumble to ruin, there would be no security for the weak, no respect for age or consanguinity, Astræa would again take her flight to the skies :

"Strength should be lord of imbecility,  
And the rude son should strike his father dead ;  
Force should be right ; or, rather, right and wrong—  
Between whose endless jar justice resides.—  
Should lose their names and so should justice too."

Ulysses sees plainly that subordination is the primal law of institutional life ; each person must fill his place in the community and must freely submit to what is above himself. But why not let institutions perish ? Then man perishes. The individual is reduced to the wild beast of nature with all its voracity, he will at once proceed to devour his own species. This ultimate reduction is also stated in all its force and abstractness by the old Greek thinker, or rather by Shakespeare :

"Then everything includes itself in power,  
Power into will, will into appetite,  
And appetite, an universal wolf,

So doubly seconded with will and power,  
Must make perforce an universal prey  
And last eat up itself."

Such is the logical outcome of "this neglect of degree," it is the destruction of institutions, and the destruction of institutions is the destruction of man. The result springs from the most severe dialectical process: the individual is resolved into appetite, and appetite being universalized, must consume all, which includes itself. No words could more distinctly prove that the Poet was in the habit of *thinking* in the true sense of the term, that is, of testing every principle by the form of universality. If this were written by a poet of to-day, it would be laughed at by many a critic as a specimen of pure German transcendentalism. That the inference before mentioned is not far-fetched, note again the language with care. Man becomes mere appetite which is a *universal* wolf, this wolf must of necessity make an *universal* prey, till it finally comes back to itself and at last *eats up itself*. With what absolute precision is the negative result drawn, with what remorseless vigor is the whole philosophy of sensualism burnt to ashes in two or three short sentences! And must the confession be made?—be merciful, oh ye gods—the statement has the very manner, or, if you please, the very knack of the Hegelian Dialectic, the most terrible of all metaphysical goblins. Having said this, let us pray, now or never—"Angels and ministers of grace defend us."

There is such a determination on the part of many writers to reduce the greatest and wisest of poets to the same dimensions as themselves, that any attempt to exhibit his thought, is met with a storm of ridicule. To be sure Shakespeare is the supreme genius of the world, but I can exhaust him at a single hasty reading; to be sure his intellect is most profound, but I can probe it to the bottom at a glance. It is so flattering to human vanity and so easy compared with the tediousness of study to say, I did not see that meaning when I read the play and therefore it does not exist at all. But the fact remains that Shakespeare gives many indications of being acquainted with former systems of thought; his allusions to Plato and Aristotle even in his earliest works would show that he had already in youth delved in the richest mines of ancient speculation. His power over abstract expression can be seen in all his writings, but it is the great and abiding interest of this drama that he gives the most direct and purest

statement of his views of nature, man, and society. That there should be striking coincidences of ideas and even of method between the greatest thinker and the greatest poet, without either's borrowing from the other is most credible; both have the same ultimate thought, though its utterance is, in general, very different; each expresses the deepest and subtlest principle of his age, the one employing mainly the abstract forms of thought, the other mainly the poetic forms of imagination.

Such is the argument for the institutional world put into the mouth of Ulysses by Shakespeare. Never did thought defend more sternly and successfully the choicest acquisitions of the race. Still to careful students of the Poet the doctrines are not new. Though he has nowhere else expressed them so completely, they really form the ground work of all his dramas, and are the inspiration of his poetical activity. Why is Shakespeare the greatest of poets? Not because of his language, or of his imagery, or of his constructive ability, or even of his characterisation; these are all very wonderful indeed, but they have been reached by lesser minds. His supreme greatness lies in his comprehension and embodiment of the ethical, that is, institutional world; its profoundest collisions he penetrates with his inevitable glance, he knows too their mediation and final solution. It has been the object of these essays, as the reader doubtless has perceived, to drop all minor points of view and hold the eye unswervingly upon this one element. It is truly the Shakespearian world into which a person must be initiated if he would wish to stand face to face with the great bard. If we suffer the mind to lose itself in the externalities of his art, in the words, in the figures, in the versification or even in the characters, we can obtain but a very partial and very cloudy reflex of the total man.

A further observation may be added. The importance of this institutional element is not confined to the study of Shakespeare; it is the deepest moving principle of that which is vital and permanent in all literature, from the Homeric epos to the modern novel. Men will cherish and hold on to what is highest in themselves, and the work of art must adumbrate something which is of eternal interest; such are the conflicts in the Family, State, Society and institutions generally. Criticism would do well to pay attention to them, if it would rise out of the realm of mere subjective opinion to the dignity of a science, for thus it abandons caprice and fastens itself upon the most objective realities.

Ulysses has now laid bare the evil under which the Grecian army is suffering, its logical consequence also has been unfolded. But these words are still general. Who are the authors of this present state of affairs? This question brings us to the other party of the Greeks. Achilles, the mightiest warrior of them all, has withdrawn from active participation in the conflict and stays in his tent mocking their discomfiture. The motive is offended vanity, he has grown "dainty of his worth," he has not obtained the position which he thinks that his merit deserves. He also disapproves of the manner of conducting the war, there is too much strategy and too little fighting. An additional motive is given later, his tenderness for one of Priam's daughters, Polyxena. To Achilles is joined Patroclus, his friend, who here appears as a merry mocker caricaturing the leaders of the opposite party. But his humor has nothing malicious or bitter in it, his chief object is to make the weary hours fly more swiftly by some amusement.

Ajax too has turned sore-head and refuses to fight; his grievance also seems to be mainly unappreciated merit, though he is infected with the example of Achilles. Ajax represents mere physical strength without brain, he is an immense mass of muscle. The difference between him and Achilles is that the latter has also bodily dexterity, and is possessed of more mind, though this is not excessive. Still both maintain the side of force against the intellectual direction of the war as upheld by Ulysses. To Ajax is joined Thersites, one of the most prominent characters of the play, whose utterances have impressed some critics so strongly that he has been considered to represent Shakespeare's own opinions concerning the Trojan war and its heroes. The main purport of the whole drama has thus been found in his sayings. Thersites reflects the negative element of the Grecian enterprise; he sees the weak side and only the weak side of everybody and everything; in this field lies all his intellectual shrewdness. He is therefore the supreme fault-finder, his speech is nothing but biting satire, his "gall coins slander like a mint." He cannot comprehend that which is universal and supreme in such a national undertaking; but he has the keenest eye and the sharpest tongue for the petty faults and foibles of the leaders who are after all only the instruments for the accomplishment of a great principle. Ajax sets him to reviling the chiefs of the opposite party, though little of his abuse of

them appears in the play, for Thersites evidently appreciated the intellect of Ulysses; but upon Ajax and Achilles he pours the full flood of his bile. Thersites and Patroclus are both attendants and to a certain extent take the place of clowns: but the latter is a sportive humorist who can laugh at the ridiculous phase of a cause which he at last dies for, while the former is the pure satirist whose soul is blasted with its own curse and who can have no principle to die for. He is therefore an arrant coward.

Such are the two parties which have developed themselves in the Grecian army. It is the struggle between the hand and the head, between force and intellect. Ulysses states the difficulty: the carefully elaborated policy of the leaders is called cowardice, wisdom is counted no member of the war, brain is to be governed by brawn:

"The still and mental parts  
That do contrive how many hands shall strike  
When fitness calls them on, and know by measure  
Of their observant toil the enemies' weight—  
Why this hath not a finger's dignity,  
They call this bed-work, mappery, closet-war,"

and so withdraw from the field of battle. These are the public reasons which Achilles and Ajax give for their course, though their private and doubtless more potent reason has already been stated to be a lack of due appreciation of their deserts.

But now comes the remedy, for intelligence here too must assert its supremacy and control in some way these men of muscle; they must be won. Ulysses will be equal to the emergency; the challenge just received from Troy furnishes the opportunity. His plan is to divide the opposite party. Ajax can be secured by a little flattery, which is at once administered with astonishing effect, for it even turns him into an enemy of his fellow-grumbler, Achilles. But the latter is a far more difficult case to manage, for he is not stupid and really knows his own worth. No extravagant laudation can catch him, indeed he has long been used to it, and must have yielded ere this, if such means were sufficient. On the contrary the extraordinary marks of admiration which are still shown him by the Greeks serve to keep alive his haughty pride. Therefore the opposite method must be employed with

him, instead of praise neglect. Since it is applause which ruins him, Ulysses proposes to elevate another man over him :

“ By device let blockish Ajax draw  
The sort to fight with Hector: among ourselves  
Give him allowance for the better man,  
For that will physic the great myrmidon,  
Who broils in loud applause, and make him fall  
His crest that prouder than blue Iris bends.”

How clear the diagnosis and how suitable the medicine ! It will be noticed that Ulysses always takes Nestor into counsel, the two then control Agamemnon. Nestor is the man of supreme appreciation ; he too had his plan, for he first advised that Achilles be selected as the antagonist of Hector ; but he at once abandons his own scheme when he hears the better one of Ulysses. He is not good at origination, but his judgment is without a cloud, without a trace of personal vanity.

The plan is carried into execution. Achilles is passed by without the customary marks of respect from the Greeks, he notices the slight and muses on the fickleness of popular favor. While in this mood Ulysses passes before him, perusing a book with great intentness. A strange book was that for camp reading in Homeric times. Ulysses cites from it the remarkable statement that man

“ Can not make boast to have that which he hath,  
Nor feels not what he owes, but by reflection.”

What can this mean, asks the horrified modern reader with the metaphysical bugbear rising in his imagination. But Achilles, though rather lean in intellect, clearly understands the passage, for he illustrates it with a striking and appropriate comparison ; indeed to him “ this is not strange at all.” Wonderful men were those old heroes ! The seed has fallen on good ground, and Ulysses enforces the same doctrine a second time with a much stronger turn of expression :

“ No man is the lord of anything,  
Though in and of him there be much consisting,  
Till he communicate his parts to others :  
Nor doth he of himself know them for aught  
Till he behold them formed in the applause  
Where they are extended ——”



The metaphysical deluge is again upon us; is there then no plan of salvation? But the matter keeps getting worse. We might have pardoned that former abstruse discussion on institutions, for it was a theme so dear to the Poet; yet now he plunges remorselessly into the deepest psychological question known to philosophy. But what has the devout man to do except to struggle after, with the prayerful hope of soon touching bottom? Ulysses here states the doctrine of reflection, and what is more strange he uses for its designation exactly the term employed in modern systems of thought. Man cannot truly possess anything unless his possession is reflected through others; nay, he cannot truly know anything till his knowledge is reflected back to himself through others. Then both possession and knowledge are real, objective; otherwise they are idle figments of the brain.

All this reasoning, however, only prepares the way for a practical application of the doctrine to Achilles, who is thus caught in the web of his own principle. He has retired from active warfare; can he be surprised then if he finds himself no longer reflected in the applause of the Greeks, but that Ajax has taken his place? The case is clear, all past fame is lost unless rescued by present activity. The controlling motive of his character is now reached, and to it is added the stinging reproach that he, the great warrior of Greece, submits to be the lover of one of Priam's daughters. Ulysses departs, and it shows the character of Patroclus that he has before urged and now again urges these same views upon his friend. Patroclus is at bottom a patriot, though he must have his joke at the expense of the leaders. The opposition of Achilles is manifestly broken, though he does not directly say that he will return and take part in the war. But afterwards he is present with the other Greek leaders at the intended combat between Ajax and Hector, and there challenges the Trojan hero.

So harmony seems again to be restored in the Greek army. It is the brain of Ulysses which is everywhere seen in these transactions, the feat is purely intellectual. When the fighting comes he steps into the background, and the interest diminishes. The great error of Grecian discipline, lack of subordination, he exposes; the breach between the leaders he heals by winning Ajax and then Achilles. Such is the one side in this war; we are now ready to pass over to the other side and take a glance at its inter-

nal condition. The Trojans have also two parties within their walls, the division springs from a question of policy, namely the surrender of Helen. A message has been received that her delivery to the Greeks will end the war; upon this subject we are now to hear the deliberations.

Around Priam who presides and who seems rather to favor the surrender is gathered the wonderful group of his sons. Hector advises to give her up; the hazards of war are uncertain, many lives have been lost, and moreover Helen is worthless in character. It can be seen that Hector advances the ethical view, caprice and passion cannot sway his judgment, the Good is something real and not an individual whim, "value dwells not in the particular will;" this last expression again sounds like a technical term of the schools and vividly recalls *der besondere Wille* of German philosophy. But the strongest argument of Hector is based upon the right of the Family, of which the abduction of Helen was a gross violation; "the law of nature and of nations" demands to have the wife restored to the husband. The religious element of Troy represented by the priest Helenus and the prophetess Cassandra urge the same view of the question after their own peculiar methods. But Paris and Troilus are strongly opposed to her surrender. The former claims that he had the consent of them all for his act; still if this were not the case, he would cling to his prize, for his controlling principle is not moral goodness, but sensual love which has its completest embodiment in the beauty of Helen. Troilus argues decidedly in the same direction, his own relation to Cressida renders him susceptible of the passion which now darkens his judgment; but he has also another and better motive, the maintenance of the majesty of the king his father and of the dignity of his country. To this last aspect of the subject Hector finally assents, clearly against his notions of right. National honor, but chiefly personal glory quench the claims of conscience. Retribution will overtake both in accordance with the nature of their deeds, as we shall see hereafter. So the great warrior is won, the two parties have fused, and Troy is substantially united in the determination to keep Helen.

Here ends the first movement with its two threads, both of which have a tendency toward unity. The war-thread which has just been developed has perhaps the most purely intellectual tinge found in the works of Shakespeare. So much reflection

and so little action, so much deliberation and so little passion, cannot be pointed out elsewhere in his dramas. Then there is Ulysses, the supremely intellectual hero, in a far higher sense than Hamlet. For Hamlet's mind is defective if not diseased, it is forever caught in its own cobwebs and cannot march forward to the deed. But the thought of Ulysses, so profound yet so transparent, never destroys itself but proceeds by necessity to realization; it must find itself reflected, to use his own term, in the world around him. But now the character of the whole drama begins to change, the thought becomes more jejune, the structure more fragmentary and confused. The second movement which commences here is far inferior to that which has preceded, and grows worse till the end. But the two threads can still be followed, though their demarkation is by no means as plain and sharp as it was in the previous movement.

The love thread which portrayed the happy culmination in the emotional union of the pair, Troilus and Cressida, is now to exhibit their separation both external and internal, both in space and in spirit. Calchas, the father of Cressida, who has performed many important services for the Greeks, demands that she be exchanged for a noble Trojan prisoner and brought to the Greek camp. The request is granted, Cressida has to leave Troy and Troilus, Diomed is sent to bring her to her parent. The parting-scene of the lovers manifests anew their characters. Troilus feels the possibility of Cressida's desertion, she will be unable to resist the grace and flattery of her Grecian suitors. To be sure, she spurns the imputation of infidelity, but devotion has never been her supreme principle, hence her readiness to change individuals. The chivalrous bearing and sweet compliments of Diomed seem to touch her favor, even in this scene where she is taking leave of Troilus, who shows decided marks of jealousy, not without cause. She passes to the Grecian camp where each hero gives her a kiss in turn, though Ulysses, the wise man, passes judgment upon her character. That judgment is very severe, it implies that she is without modesty and without fidelity.

She is already in love with Diomed, the tie of affection which bound her to Troilus is broken. The latter comes from Troy and beholds with his own eyes her faithlessness, and hears with his own ears her declaration of desertion. The struggle is a most intense one, but he gives her up and slips "the bonds of Heaven." She says that her eye leads her mind; her love is for the last

man whom she looks upon. The sensual side of her nature is here most strongly emphasized, whereas in the first movement her striking trait was the cool understanding which held control over her emotions; this is not a contradiction perhaps, but certainly a difference. There is no retribution for her act; judged by Shakespeare's usual method, her treatment is incomplete. But Troilus has tasted a little of his own advice before the Trojan council; he would not permit the wife Helen to be restored to her husband; the advocate of violent separation is himself separated from her whom he loved. Still the fact remains that the faithful man is punished and the faithless woman goes free.

The war-thread is next to be carried forward from the point where it was left. The hostile sides, having come to internal unity, are prepared for the external fight. Diomed is the messenger, and while he is among the Trojans, he has occasion to give his opinion of the war. It is an intensely satirical view, both Paris and Menelaus equally deserve Helen since they make no "scruple of her soilage," and the whole commotion is only a scramble for a strumpet. Diomed, like many a soldier since his time, evidently wishes that he had not enlisted, and damns the war. It has been already noticed that Thersites holds the same view; "nothing but lechery; all incontinent varlets," is his unvarnished characterization of the struggle and the heroes. But Diomed is a warrior and a chivalrous gentleman, while Thersites is the universal fault-finder and base coward. These two persons represent in the main the satirical element which some critics have found in the entire play, notwithstanding its far more elevated positive characters.

The single combat between Ajax and Hector now takes place, in the true medieval fashion. But there is not satire here in the proper sense of the term, for satire selects the weaknesses, the finite elements of an individual, society, or great enterprise and holds them up to scorn and indignation. There is however burlesque in the entire account of the challenge and the duel, for burlesque puts its content into an alien form, as in the present instance the old Homeric personages and occurrences are thrust into the manners of chivalry. But notwithstanding this humorous coloring the collision of the two nations is genuine and earnest. The combatants meet; after a little fencing, sufficient to clear the honor of both, Hector refuses to fight Ajax since the latter is his cousin. Hector, though of the loftiest courage and

generosity, is without pride, he is the antithesis of Achilles. He will not shed the blood of his own family even if hostile; though the disgrace of the surrender hangs over him, he offers to throw down his weapons and to embrace his "father's sister's son."

So ends the first combat. Hector visits the Grecian princes, he receives knightly welcome and sumptuous entertainment. He there is greeted with a challenge from Achilles who however will first honor him with the most gracious hospitality. There is a vein of incongruity running through these scenes which added to the merry bantering of the chieftains produces a ridiculous effect. But the challenge of Achilles is countermanded by a secret letter from Troy, love in his case too triumphs over war, his "major vow" is the pledge sworn to Polyxena. Thus the persuasive words of Ulysses are lost, the strongest motive of Achilles is here not wounded pride, but his passion for Priam's daughter. But there is still another change in the motivation, his friendship for Patroclus is more powerful than his love; since the death of Patroclus rouses him to go to battle in which he slays Hector, though in a manner most cowardly and wholly inconsistent with both his previous position and character. It will thus be seen that the most elaborate and most profound part of the play, the reconciliation of Achilles through the dexterity of Ulysses is without a purpose, it is a colossal instrumentality which produces no ultimate effect. On the contrary a motive almost unknown, and certainly not developed in the drama is dragged in from Homer to determine the result. Hector the most noble, generous, and humane of all the chieftains Grecian or Trojan, perishes, though there is an attempt to justify his fate through his disregard of the entreaties of parents, sister and wife, and of the omens of Heaven. But the deeper ethical retribution was prepared in the Trojan council when he surrendered conviction mainly to desire for personal glory; the result is, he is destroyed in its pursuit. But the parting scene at Priam's palace is clearly the motive intended here.

The termination of this drama resembles a goodly ship going to pieces amid the breakers; gradually it splits asunder, and nothing is seen but the disconnected fragments floating on the surface of the angry waters. The play is literally wrecked. The characters become different and even inconsistent, the great preparations of the first movement are inadequately carried out, or entirely dropped, the action and the structure are confused, un-

necessary parts are introduced, and necessary parts are omitted. To name the work has given great difficulty; it is not comedy, tragedy, history, or special drama; inasmuch as the true end is wanting, there can be no complete proof for any designation. As it stands, the war-thread ends in the death of Hector which must pass for tragic; though Hector is not the leading character of this thread. But the love-thread terminates in mere separation, which is no solution at all, as there is no requital for the deed. The usual method of Shakespeare is to reward the fidelity of the woman with a restoration of her estranged lover—Julia, Helena, Hermione, Imogen; but the fidelity of the man to a treacherous or unreciprocating beauty is compensated by bestowing upon him another mistress who will be faithful, as is seen in the first and second loves of Romeo, and in the case of Duke Orsino. The devoted Troilus deserves a change of individuals. Certainly none of the characters of this thread have a tragic motive. On the whole the tendency is to the special or mediated drama, though that tendency is by no means fulfilled. The course of the war-thread might be: Achilles, under the influence of the intellect of Ulysses, is reconciled with the Greeks, goes forth to meet Hector and slays him, the restoration of Helen follows with peace between the contending peoples. Thus the national collision is solved, and in the first movement of the play there is much to indicate some such conclusion. In this manner the present negative end is brought to a positive reconciliation in both the threads; namely, war ends in peace, and fidelity is rewarded with fruition. To reconstruct Shakespeare is an act of temerity, but it may be permitted to his faithful readers to think as complete what he has without doubt left incomplete.

The purport of the whole play has been supposed to be satirical and also humorous. That both these elements are present in it must be at once granted, but they are subordinate. The collision is serious, between nations, and on both sides there is violation and justification, a wrong and a right. The Greeks vindicate the Family but assail the State, while the Trojans vindicate nationality but violate the Family. It is a genuine conflict in these institutions, and not a delusion. Moreover the leading characters on both sides are imbued with deep earnestness. The satirists and merry-makers in one form and another are found in all conflicts of society, and hence they are not absent even from the tragedies of Shakespeare. To account for the marked inequality

in this drama conjecture has not been idle; the weak part is variously supposed to have been written by the poet in his youth, or in a bad mood, or not at all by him but by some other playwright or playwrights. It is perhaps immaterial which view is adopted, they have all quite the same degree of probability, and rest upon equally good evidence.

---

## KANT'S ETHICS.

BY JAMES EDMUNDS.

[Continued from Vol. VIII., p. 351].

### VI. — *Ethical Worship.*

§101—As the lightning that lightens out of the one part under heaven shines unto the other part under heaven, so does the Kantian doctrine of the indefinite series illumine the whole universe. All phenomena lie in series of indefinite extent: and the completion of every series is THE INFINITE, “for in Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your own poets have said.” All antinomies consist just herein:\* that the human understanding cannot determine the relation of THE INFINITE to any given series (§78); and the indifference of every antinomy, sole indubitable deliverance of every reason, is THE INFINITE.

§102—All thought proceeds in a sensible series, a series therefore *a priori* infinitely divisible and infinitely protensible. Consciousness, “needed conditionally only to make the perception clearer or more perspicuous” (KANT'S Religion, book IV., apotome II., section IV.), whether regressing, progressing, or envisaging, finds in this series that INFINITY, which is moreover required to constitute that unity without which consciousness were itself impossible (§§16, 98).

§103—Hence, according to the most enlightened philosophy no less than the common understanding, ethic issues naturally and

---

\*The proper place for the proof of this is the transcendental dialectic, which clears illusions and fallacies out of the way of those practical principles upon which alone ethics and religion are securely founded.